

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(a) over Sturman. Applicants respectfully disagree since the MPEP requires that a reference disclose exactly what an Applicant has claimed in order to support a §102(a) rejection, and Sturman does not do this. Nevertheless, Applicants have canceled these claims rendering the rejections moot.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Sturman in view of Miller. Again, Applicants disagree, but have canceled this claim rendering the rejection moot.

Claim 6 and 10-16 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In response, Applicants have amended claims 6 and 10 into independent form. Claim 17-21 stand allowed. Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter. No additional fee is believed required in view of the cancelled claims.

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance of claims 6 and 10-21. However, if the Examiner believes that some minor additional clarification would put this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (812) 333-5355 in order to hasten the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MB McNeil', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael B. McNeil
Reg. No. 35,949